

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 7, 2004, the drawings are objected to; claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; claims 1-2, 7-10 and 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McDowell (U.S. Patent No. 5,624,098); claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDowell in view of Applicant's Prior Art (Hereinafter "APA"); claims 1-2, 4, 7-11, 14-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodlief et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,740,851; hereinafter "Woodlief"); claim 18 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodlief in view of APA; and claims 1-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lundgards (U.S. Patent No. 5,692,722). The foregoing rejections and objections are respectfully traversed.

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification, FIG. 2 and claims 1, 2, 3, 8 and 13 have been amended for clarification purposes. Claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration.

All of the foregoing references relied upon fail to discuss "a supporting structure of a refrigerator having a main body with a storage compartment and a base provided in a lower part of the main body," as recited in claim 1. Further, these references also fail to discuss the supporting structure comprising "a support provided under the main body to support the main body... [and] a supporting bracket connected with a side surface of the base of the main body, to connect the side surface of the base of the main body with the support," as recited in amended claim 1.

Instead, McDowell discusses an interlock and anti-tip device to prevent an appliance from tipping over when the door of the appliance is opened (see Abstract and column 3, lines 43-45). The anti-tip device includes a first bracket 30 secured to a floor and having an open-ended slot for receiving a support leg of the appliance (see FIG. 5). A second bracket is secured to the first bracket and is capable of engaging an interlock switch of an appliance. The interlock prevents the appliance from operating if the anti-tip device is not installed properly. That is, the anti-tip device in McDowell requires appliances which include support legs and each leg having a foot which rest upon the floor (see column 3, lines 34-40), and to secure at least one of the support legs to the floor (see column 4, lines 43-46). Therefore, McDowell teaches away from the claimed invention.

Woodlief discusses a mounting device for removably attaching a dispensing unit of a hot melt adhesive system to a support surface (see Abstract). Further, FIG. 6 of Woodlief discloses

a detachable sub-base consisting of a rectangular mounting plate and an opposed pair of parallel flanges spaced apart to receive the dispensing unit (see column 5, lines 46-65). The mounting plate may be mounted to another piece of equipment and the mounting plate is then secured with the dispensing unit. That is, the mounting device is mounted to a support surface and then the dispensing unit is mounted to the mounting device. As shown in FIG. 6, a bottom portion of the mounting plate is coupled with the support surface and the dispensing unit is coupled with the mounting plate.

Lundagards discloses a locking device for locking an article to a support member (see Abstract). The locking device includes two locking members anchored to the support and two locking members anchored to the object. The locking members have grooves and projections, respectively such that the projections move into the grooves and fit therein (see column 2, lines 1-11). As shown in FIG. 2, the locking members are positioned underneath the article.

Moreover, dependent claims 2-7 and 9-19 recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. For example, claim 3/2 recites "the supporting bracket...comprises an upper supporting part bent from the side supporting part to support a lower part of the main body".

Claim 8 recites similar limitations as recited in amended claim 1.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

March 29, 2005

By:

Deidre M. Davis
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

IN THE DRAWINGS:

In the Office Action at item 1, the Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to illustrate the features recited in claim 18. In order to overcome the objection, a replacement sheet for FIG. 2 is submitted herewith. In FIG. 2, "shock absorbers 60" have been added. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.